## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Government,

HONORABLE GEORGE CARAM STEEH

v.

No. 15-20652

D-3 EUGENE FISHER,

D-4 COREY BAILEY,

D-6 ROBERT BROWN,

D-13 ARLANDIS SHY,

D-16 JAMES ROBINSON,

D-19 KEITHON PORTER,

Defendants.

## STATUS CONFERENCE HEARING

Monday, May 1, 2017

**APPEARANCES:** 

For the Government: CHRISTOPHER GRAVELINE, ESQ.

Assistant U.S. Attorney

For the Defendants: HENRY M. SCHARG, ESQ.

On behalf of Eugene Fisher

JOHN R. MINOCK, ESQ.

KEITH A. SPIELFOGEL, ESQ. On behalf of Corey Bailey

JAMES FEINBERG, ESQ. JOHN R. MARTIN, ESO.

On behalf of Robert Brown

MARK MAGIDSON, ESQ.

JOHN THEIS, ESQ.

On behalf of Arlandis Shy

WILLIAM SWOR, ESQ.
On behalf of James Robinson

JUAN MATEO, ESQ.
On behalf of Keithon Porter

To Obtain Certified Transcript, Contact:
Ronald A. DiBartolomeo, Official Court Reporter
Theodore Levin United States Courthouse
231 West Lafayette Boulevard, Room 238
Detroit, Michigan 48226
(313) 962-1234

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography. Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

Case 2:25.15.16 rc2/0303625125 GS-SD-ROG E OFE (N/b) .785549 Fille (1.0/2/03/1/19 PgP2 age 1/21/20 F73 ID 1/21/20 ID 1

| 1  | Detroit, Michigan                                      |
|----|--|
| 2  | Monday, May 1, 2017                                    |
| 3  |  |
| 4  | THE CLERK: Case Number 15-20652, United                |
| 5  | States of America versus Eugene Fisher, Corey Bailey,  |
| 6  | Robert Brown, Arlandis Shy, James Robinson and Keithon |
| 7  | Porter.  |
| 8  | MR. GRAVELINE: Good afternoon. Chris                   |
| 9  | Graveline and Raj Prasad for the United States.        |
| 10 | THE COURT: Welcome.                                    |
| 11 | MR. SCHARG: Good afternoon. Henry Scharg on            |
| 12 | behalf of Eugene Fisher.                               |
| 13 | MR. MAGIDSON: Good afternoon, your Honor.              |
| 14 | Mark Magidson on behalf of Mr. Shy.                    |
| 15 | MR. THEIS: John Theis on behalf of Mr. Shy             |
| 16 | as well.   |
| 17 | MR. SPIELFOGEL: Good afternoon, your Honor.            |
| 18 | Keith Spielfogel on behalf of Corey Bailey.            |
| 19 | MR. MINOCK: John Minock on behalf of Corey             |
| 20 | Bailey.  |
| 21 | MR. MATEO: Good afternoon, your Honor. Juan            |
| 22 | Mateo appearing on behalf of Keithon Porter.           |
| 23 | MR. SWOR: Good afternoon, your Honor.                  |
| 24 | William Swor on behalf with James Robinson.            |
| 25 | MR. FEINBERG: James L. Feinberg and John               |
|    |  |
|    | 15-20652; USA v. EUGENE FISHER, ET AL                  |

Martin on behalf of Robert Brown.

2.0

THE COURT: Okay. Welcome.

MR. GRAVELINE: Good afternoon, your Honor. This being a status conference, at our last status conference, we talked about having all the discovery out by April 15th. That is not been accomplished in this case. Since the last status conference, we have produced over 2,400 pages of discovery, numerous security camera footage, Instagram returns, jail calls to particular defendants, and other related evidence to include photographs and YouTube material.

By our account, we still have about 500 more pages of materials less the -- the agent who has been doing this since our last status conference is looking at the indictment, going through every overt act, collecting information. So an overt act, for example, talks about selling prescription pills in West Virginia. They have gone to West Virginia, collected reports, collected witness statements. If there is any physical evidence, they've collected that. Any lab reports, and so all of those things are being collected, and then being turned over to the defense.

We believe these last 500 pages will be produced by the end of this week, and then in terms of the particular defendants here, I've received correspondence

from Mr. Feinberg and Mr. Minock asking for particular pieces of discovery, as well as Mr. Mateo as well. We have been working through that. Some of it -- and I will be the first to say -- that I have been completely responsible. For last three weeks I have been preparing for another trial that was suppose start last Tuesday. I owe them some responses here.

Most of it goes towards some of the cell phone materials. Mr. Feinberg put together a letter asking for I believe eight different things, and we have been talking about that before trial, before this hearing as well. So we are working through the discovery. We are talking to each other.

The biggest pieces that I think we need to get out still other than these 500 pages that we currently have, are our expert witness notice, which would include all of the lab people who tested drugs, firearms, cell phone expert report. That's been a topic of conversation in this group, what exactly what our cell phone expert will say. They have the raw data, but they are looking for the cell phone expert report.

Since this group is trailing the first group a little bit, I think I will be producing at the same time as to Group 1, the same material for Group 2. The discovery that remains in terms of police reports and

those types of articles will be done by this Friday. I will be talking with my cell phone expert, if not by the end of the day today, hopefully by tomorrow to get a timeline on his report, which I think will be sometime during the month of May we'll have that out. I don't want to give a date certain until I have spoken to him, but that's what we're looking for right now.

For the record for this particular group, just to inform this particular group where they stand in relation to Group 1, Group 1 just had a trial date set for October 10, 2017, motion cutoff date of July 31th for the motions, and a plea cutoff date of September 18th, and the Court stated that you will be gone for most of the month of December in the Ninth Circuit.

**THE COURT:** Correct.

MR. GRAVELINE: So it is just to inform this trial group where they stand in relation to that group.

As we laid out in the last status conference is the plan in this case to see what the Capital Case Unit and the Attorney General plans to do with Mr. Arnold's capital case first and foremost, and with Mr. Arnold, his counsel stated that they believe that they will have their mitigation packet submitted to us, U.S. Attorney's Office, by June 15th and hopefully before that, and we hope to have a decision based on the Court scheduling this on

behalf of Mr. Arnold by the end of July, and so if we have that decision, I think that will then help inform what will happen in this particular group, and also when mitigation and decisions have to be made for this particular group as well, for those individuals who still face death eligible charges.

In terms of I believe the last time we held a status conference in terms of a general trial date for the second group, we talked of January of 2018. Based upon what we set in the first group, I think that's still realistic. If we can get that first group done in October and November, I think it's still realistic to try this case in January. I would suggest mid-January as oppose to early on, and that would give the Court 6-7 weeks between trials, and it would help us sort out where we stand in terms of the various pieces of evidence and whatnot.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. GRAVELINE: That would be the government's status report at this time in terms of both discovery and where we stand in terms of time in this case.

THE COURT: So how much will be lagging behind the first group in terms of discovery for this group? Is it going to be completed simultaneously with the first?

MR. GRAVELINE: I would say for the most part, yes. The one difference could be, for example, Mr. Feinberg asked for several pieces of discovery from a 2006 homicide that Mr. Brown was charged with. Depending on how the evidence breaks out, maybe we won't be presenting as much on the 2006 homicide during that first trial since Mr. Brown is not part of that first trial.

So that's -- I think a client specific type discovery might lag behind the general discovery that we're talking about, but I think we're working through some of those issues, and where we agree and disagree, I believe talking to defense, they might be filing some motions for earlier disclosure of information, but I think in terms of general discovery, I think that will be pretty much on pace where Group 1 is.

If I could suggest to the Court that maybe the motion practice for this group perhaps lag behind that first group by a month so while-- or even to maybe the motions would be due with this group on September 30th, and even though we will be in trial, there are three of us who are participating from the prosecution side. So we will be able to respond to the motions from Group 2 while in trial on Group 1. We can set that type of motion for this group.

THE COURT: Unless you are unable to have the

discovery along the same pace, but it sounds like you could?

MR. GRAVELINE: I think discovery will go along the same pace. So for example, the cell phone expert report will be given to all counsel in all three groups at the same time. I'm not going to hold back just because of the second group.

The only question are the client specific type of discovery. So regardless when we do the motion deadline, if we have those types of discovery disputes, perhaps it's just a matter of we argue as we go along here, as oppose to waiting until -- you know, in terms of discovery dispute when, where and how much discovery we're obligated to turn over to them.

THE COURT: My question was whether it's possible to keep enough flexibility in the process so if a number of individuals in Group 1 decide to take advantage of a plea agreement, others could be moved up if they are otherwise far enough along in discovery.

MR. GRAVELINE: Well, I think in terms of this particular group, I think perhaps the only defendant who might be able to take advantage of a situation like that is Mr. Robinson, simply because I don't know -- and I'll let defense counsel speak to this -- from a mitigation point of view, they'll have their mitigation

packet prepared, and we'll have a decision from Washington D.C. in time to move up into the October 10th trial date. They are still, based on my conversations with them, they are still working pretty hard. They are pretty focused on that piece as oppose to moving up for trial. In this particular group, I think that might only be Mr. Robinson.

**THE COURT:** Okay.

MR. GRAVELINE: Thank you.

MR. SWOR: Your Honor, considering the fact that we've received no discovery that identifies specific to Mr. Robinson, the suggestion that we could be ready for a multiple defendant death penalty level trial by September is absurd. The government has resisted my requests to turn over specific information. I'm going to be filing a motion, but it cannot be trial by ambush.

MR. FEINBERG: One of the things that -- Jim Feinberg on behalf of Mr. Brown -- the Court is aware that in 2006, another person in Frank Murphy Recorder's Court was found guilty twice of the murder that Mr. Brown is now being accused of committing in federal court. Apparently, there is a complete transcript of the second trial. There is no transcript of the first trial because the notes were lost.

The government has now the entire transcript of that trial. They paid \$1,800 in Frank Murphy for that

transcript. The government's response to my asking them for a copy is, we can get it the same way they did. So I don't know whether or not the Court wants to issue an order allowing that transcript to be paid out of CJA funds, or that the government make a copy of the transcript. Apparently there's nine volumes of transcripts.

I am fully aware that the court reporters need to be paid, but I don't know whether or not the government -- if the Court wants CJA to buy another entire transcript when, in fact, the government has it.

MR. GRAVELINE: Just to be clear on this, the court reporters are independent contractors both here and at Frank Murphy Hall of Justice. This is how they get pay. Not in this case, but I've had multiple court reporters saying, why are you handing out the transcripts for free when they can order a copy, and I can be paid for what I do? So that's genesis of this.

Now if the Court decides that no, we're not paying CJA funds, that's, you know, the genesis, and you know, I'm -- you know, this part of negotiation -- not negotiation -- the court reporters have asked me on multiple occasions to push back a little bit and say, people have to order their own copy. That was my suggestion. They can order their own a copy and apply for

| 1  | CJA funds. If the Court decides, no, not paying that and   |
|----|--|
| 2  | we're told to hand it over, we'll hand it over. That's     |
| 3  | the genesis of that. I'm not trying to be some             |
| 4  | obstruction here. I got it, you don't. That's the          |
| 5  | genesis.   |
| 6  | THE COURT: Is Mr. Feinberg the only one                    |
| 7  | affected by this?  |
| 8  | MR. GRAVELINE: Yes, of that particular                     |
| 9  | transcript.  |
| 10 | THE COURT: Was the transcript actually                     |
| 11 | produced for you?  |
| 12 | MR. GRAVELINE: We asked them to prepare it.                |
| 13 | It's been prepared and done as of last week, and we have   |
| 14 | paid for that initial copy of the transcript.              |
| 15 | THE COURT: So it would presumably be an                    |
| 16 | additional copy?   |
| 17 | MR. GRAVELINE: I think it would be at a                    |
| 18 | discounted rate.   |
| 19 | THE COURT: I'll figure it out. I'll check                  |
| 20 | it out.  |
| 21 | MR. FEINBERG: If CJA funds have to be                      |
| 22 | used and I don't know how the court reporter gets paid,    |
| 23 | whether I have to pay the court reporter out of my pocket, |
| 24 | and then get reimbursed                                    |
| 25 | THE CLERK: You have to file a motion.                      |

MR. FEINBERG: But they get the order that 1 2 they have to submit a voucher. 3 THE COURT: Give me a couple of days to figure it out. 4 MR. FEINBERG: There are additional materials 5 6 related to the homicide that Mr. Brown is charged with, 7 the entire Detroit homicide file at that time back in 2006 8 include all of the witness statements. The government is 9 saying they don't want to give it to us because it may be 10 Jencks. Well, if there are witness statements that say 11 someone else committed the crime, that's not Jencks. 12 That's exculpatory, and is something we need immediately. 13 Also, we made need it for mitigation purposes. 14 THE COURT: All right. 15 MR. GRAVELINE: Mr. Feinberg and I have discussed this, and that might be a good substance for a 16 17 motion. 18 **THE COURT:** Okay. Mr. Mateo? 19 MR. MATEO: Your Honor, on behalf of Mr. 20 Porter, Mr. Graveline as noted previously, we've sent the

think we should be provided discovery. I know you've been busy, and I can personally attest to that. I'm going to add to that list. I have another situation where I'm requesting certain files from the Wayne County

government written correspondence on a matter that we

21

22

23

24

25

2.0

Prosecutor's Office, and because there's one case pending, they cannot release that information. I will propose to the government by a stipulated order, that they order

Wayne County Prosecutor's Office to turn that material over to us, and there may be other files that they have.

I have an outstanding request that I may need assistance on. I may need those files for purposes of the mitigation package.

The only other question or note that I want to make in terms of discovery is they have told you that they have 500 additional pages. I don't believe that would cover what I believe is missing. So is there a way we can have an understanding as to when we file our discovery motion so we can sort this out if we have to?

THE COURT: I don't see any reason to delay or file such a motion if you feel there's enough to demonstrate a show cause.

MR. MATEO: We'll do.

THE COURT: You're not restricted.

MR. GRAVELINE: Just for the record, we will not be agreeing to a stipulated order demanding the Wayne County Prosecutor's Office to turn over the files, just like we would not appreciate them stipulating to anything coming out of our files. The United States government will not enter into a stipulated order to that effect. So

Mr. Mateo can file a motion, and that will be the subject of some litigation at trial.

THE COURT: So you're indicating that they won't share with you either?

MR. GRAVELINE: I would imagine that, and to be quite honest with you, I think I know exactly the situation that Mr. Mateo is talking about here. I would not -- no, I would not be seeking the contents of their files for the particular person that he is talking about.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. GRAVELINE: I cannot imagine this will be a situation where that I will be going to the Wayne County Prosecutor's Office saying, you have to hand me over this material in their investigative file, just like they would not agree to that, coming to our office and saying, we need your investigative files.

Now there are Detroit Police reports and other things that Mr. Mateo wants to say, what about the Detroit Police reports? That's totally different. That's an investigative agency as oppose to a prosectorial agency, and if there's some relevance, then we can talk about that, but the investigative file from the Wayne County Prosecutor's Office, no, we will not be agreeing to that. That will be the subject of a motion.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I quess if

there are portions of that file that you feel are clearly important to receive, and maybe would not constitute materials withheld, and there's a request for some informal action by the Court, I could certainly make a call to the prosecutor's office to discuss it at least, but I want you to both agree that the information --

MR. MATEO: Your Honor, I have been in contact with the executive over at the Wayne County Prosecutor's Office, and I believe that they would probably agree to a stipulated order. So I'll do whatever I can to minimize whatever issues to bring to your attention.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. Any other input from defense counsel?

MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, just so I can be clear, if I understand what Mr. Graveline just said, which I think is totally reasonable, to wait and see what the department says about Mr. Arnold before any decision by anybody else, and I understand that to mean that with regards our submissions, we would have to wait until that. There's no reason for us to file until that decision is made. So I guess once a decision is made by Mr. Arnold, assume if Arnold is declined, they will probably decline everybody else, and then just to assume the opposite, we will have some date set after that time for us to have our

1 mitigation. 2 MR. GRAVELINE: That's correct. That's the 3 way I would envision how that would work. MR. MARTIN: We'll just wait to see what 4 happens with Mr. Arnold and go from there. 5 6 MR. GRAVELINE: That's correct, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: All right. Anybody else? All 8 right. Mr. Graveline? 9 MR. GRAVELINE: I'm not sure if now would be 10 a good time to set a trial date for Group 2 just so we 11 have it on the calendar, and so it's been my experience that all the lawyers' calendar fill up, especially when we 12 13 are setting a six to eight week trial. If the Court is 14 inclined, I believe that since Group 1 is set for the day 15 after Columbus Day, I would ask for the day after Martin Luther King Day in January for this, and block off six to 16 eight weeks. 17 18 THE COURT: How about we do it week after the 19 first? 20 THE CLERK: January 8th. 21 MR. GRAVELINE: That's fine with the 22 government, your Honor. 23 **THE COURT:** How does that work for defense? MR. SWOR: Not really. So we are going to be 24 25 preparing during the holidays?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

19

THE COURT: That will require some --MR. SWOR: Besides that, we will need the first trial transcripts. I mean, my client is charged in a count that's charged against Mr. Arnold, and obviously the evidence with regards to that, if it comes out at the trial of Mr. Arnold, is going to be critical to have. MR. SCHARG: Same thing on behalf of Mr. Fisher. Mr. Arnold's trial testimony will be critical in our defense, and I would ask the Court -- I concur more with after Martin Luther King Day, later in the month, because I don't think it is realistic to set a date so early in 2018, and I would ask the Court to reconsider. MR. FEINBERG: Judge, I would ask, looking at the calendars, that we set it right after President's Day, which is February 20th, so that following week. It's awfully tough preparing for a trial jury during the holidays. THE COURT: That's way out. MR. FEINBERG: It is only another month. THE COURT: Only another month? All right. Let's set it around the first of February then. **THE CLERK:** February 5th, a Monday. THE COURT: February 5th. If it turns out to unrealistic --MR. SWOR: Well, February 5th I quess is

| 1  | fine, but just some advance notice, the weekend of        |
|----|---|
| 2  | President's Day, Mr. Feinberg and I are already scheduled |
| 3  | to be out of town. So we may need to ask the Court for a  |
| 4  | recess.   |
| 5  | THE COURT: That will be                                   |
| 6  | MR. FEINBERG: Thursday to Monday of that                  |
| 7  | weekend.  |
| 8  | THE COURT: I imagine there will be some                   |
| 9  | interruptions from time to time. Let's set it initially   |
| 10 | for February 5th.   |
| 11 | Anything else from anyone?                                |
| 12 | MR. MAGIDSON: Judge, will we receive any                  |
| 13 | other dates for plea cutoff or motions?                   |
| 14 | THE COURT: We need a plea cutoff date.                    |
| 15 | THE CLERK: Motion cutoff date is                          |
| 16 | September 30th.   |
| 17 | MR. MATEO: December?                                      |
| 18 | THE CLERK: September 30th. Do you want to                 |
| 19 | go to October 2nd?  |
| 20 | MR. GRAVELINE: That's fine for the                        |
| 21 | government.   |
| 22 | THE CLERK: October 2nd.                                   |
| 23 | THE COURT: Plea cutoff?                                   |
| 24 | THE CLERK: January 11th.                                  |
| 25 | THE COURT: That's the plea cutoff.                        |
|    |   |

Anything else? 1 2 MR. GRAVELINE: Nothing from the government. 3 **THE COURT:** Anything from defense counsel? Excellent. See you then. 4 (Proceedings concluded.) 5 6 7 8 CERTIFICATION 9 I, Ronald A. DiBartolomeo, official court 10 reporter for the United States District Court, Eastern 11 District of Michigan, Southern Division, appointed 12 pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States 13 Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the foregoing is 14 a correct transcript of the proceedings in the above-entitled cause on the date hereinbefore set forth. 15 I do further certify that the foregoing 16 17 transcript has been prepared by me or under my direction. 18 19 Ronald A. DiBartolomeo, CSR Date 2.0 Official Court Reporter 21 22 23 24 25